

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

MAR 15 2004

VALERIE G. DUGAN
BRIAN M. DUGAN, PH.D.**DUGAN & DUGAN, PC**
PATENTS, TRADEMARKS & COPYRIGHTS
18 JOHN STREET
TARRYTOWN, NY 10591(914)332-9081 TELEPHONE
(914)332-9082 FACSIMILE
DUGANEMAIL@DUGANPATENT.COM**FACSIMILE COVER SHEET****OFFICIAL**

March 15, 2004

PLEASE DELIVER THE ATTACHED MESSAGE TO:

Examiner: Naschica S. Morrison Phone No.: (703) 305-0228
Fax No.: (703) 872-9306
From: Brian M. Dugan

Our File No.: Docket No. 4448/P2/CPS/IBSS/LAP

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Ronald Vern Schauer and John Charles
Davies
Serial No. : 10/099,900 ✓
Filed : March 14, 2002
For : FACILITIES CONNECTION BUCKET FOR PRE-
FACILITATION OF WAFER FABRICATION
EQUIPMENT
Examiner : Naschica S. Morrison
Group Art Unit : 3632

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING THIS PAGE:2

* * *

THIS FACSIMILE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE
ADDRESSEE. THE CONTENT OF THIS FACSIMILE IS PRIVILEGED
AND CONFIDENTIAL. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS FACSIMILE
IN ERROR, OR IF YOU HAVE NOT RECEIVED LEGIBLE COPIES OF
ALL PAGES, PLEASE NOTIFY US BY TELEPHONE IMMEDIATELY.

* * *

lines 44-48). The Nagai patent describes a home biodata interfacing device. (Nagai, Abstract).

Independent claims 1 and 19-21 each require "a mechanism for mounting the box to a support pedestal of a semiconductor fabrication facility." None of the Flynn, Ramberg, McCarthy, Byrne and Nagai patents appears to disclose such a limitation. Claim 23 requires "indicating a location within a fabrication facility for installing a facilities box" and "providing a standardized facilities box having a mechanism for selectively coupling any one of a set of add-on features to the standardized facilities box." The Byrne patent does not appear to disclose such limitations. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 19-21 and 23, and claims 2-3, 5-7, 10, 12-13 and 22 which depend therefrom, are not anticipated by the above references.

The rejection of claims 2-4, 7, 10 and 12 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. section 103 as being unpatentable over Flynn in view of Ramberg, the rejection of claims 14 and 17 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. section 103 as being unpatentable over Ramberg in view of JP 08-323036 (Niwa), the rejection of claims 15 and 18 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. section 103 as being unpatentable over McCarthy in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,085,987 (Vartdal) and the Applicants' traversal thereof

The Office Action rejects claims 2-4, 7, 10 and 12 under section 103 as being unpatentable over Flynn in view of Ramberg. As described above, the Flynn and Ramberg patents describe a "container and method of transport for transporting lobster and like live cargo" and "[a] container for storing live bait," respectively. (Flynn, Abstract); (Ramberg, Abstract). The Applicants respectfully submit that the Flynn and Ramberg patents are non-analogous prior art at least since containers for storing or transporting live cargo would seem entirely unrelated to (and/or unusable within and/or inconsistent with the cleanliness requirements of) the field of the Applicants'